arXiv:1611.09466v1 [math.CO] 29 Nov 2016

On Komlós' tiling theorem in random graphs

Rajko Nenadov * Nemanja Škorić †

Abstract

Conlon, Gowers, Samotij, and Schacht showed that for a given graph H and a constant $\gamma > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that if $p \geq Cn^{-1/m_2(H)}$ then asymptotically almost surely every spanning subgraph G of the random graph $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ with minimum degree at least

$$\delta(G) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)} + \gamma\right) np$$

contains an H-packing that covers all but at most γn vertices. Here, $\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)$ denotes the *critical chromatic threshold*, a parameter introduced by Komlós. We show that this theorem can be bootstraped to obtain an H-packing covering all but at most $\gamma(C/p)^{m_2(H)}$ vertices, which is strictly smaller when $p > Cn^{-1/m_2(H)}$. In the case where $H = K_3$ this answers the question of Balogh, Lee, and Samotij. Furthermore, we give an upper bound on the size of an H-packing for certain ranges of p.

1 Introduction

Given graphs G and H, a family of vertex-disjoint copies of H in G is called an *H-packing*. This generalises the notion of matchings from edges ($H = K_2$) to arbitrary graphs. The study of sufficient degree conditions on G which enforce the existence of a *perfect* H-packing (an H-packing which covers all vertices of G), usually referred to as an *H-factor*, dates back to the seminal work of Corrádi and Hajnal [8] and Hajnal and Szemerédi [10]. In particular, they showed that every graph with $n = \ell k$ vertices and minimum degree at least $(\ell-1)n/\ell$ contains an K_ℓ-factor. Such bound on the minimum degree is easily seen to be the best possible.

Progress towards generalising this result to an arbitrary graph H was made in [3, 4, 17]. The approximate result was obtained by Komlós [16], where he determined the best possible bound on the minimum degree which enforces an H-factor covering all but at most $o(n)$ vertices. In particular, he showed that the main parameter which governs the existence of such a packing is the so-called *chromatic threshold* $\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)$, defined as

$$\frac{(\chi(H)-1)v(H)}{v(H)-\sigma(H)},$$

where $\sigma(H)$ denotes the minimum size of the smallest colour class in a colouring of H with $\chi(H)$ colours.

*School of Mathematical Sciences, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia. Email: rajko.nenadov@monash.edu.
†Institute of Theoretical Computer Science, ETH Zurich, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland. Email: nskoric@inf.ethz.ch.

Theorem 1.1 (Tiling theorem [16]). *For every graph H and a constant $\gamma > 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a graph with $n \geq n_0$ vertices and*

$$\delta(G) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)}\right) n,$$

then G contains an H-packing which covers all but at most γn vertices.

Theorem 1.1 was further strengthened by Shokoufandeh and Zhao [21] and the problem was fully solved only recently by Kühn and Osthus [19]. We refer the reader to [18, 19] for a detailed survey on the history of the problem and results not mentioned here.

1.1 Packing theorems in random graphs

In this paper we are interested in up to which degree the stated theorems hold in random graphs. In particular, we consider the binomial random graph model $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$. The obvious question is for which p does $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s [1] contain a perfect H-packing. The case where $H = K_2$ was already proven by Erdős and Renyi [9] and the general case was fully resolved by Johansson, Kahn, and Vu [12]. Once this is settled, in the spirit of previously mentioned results it is natural to study whether subgraphs of random graphs with sufficiently large minimum degree contain a perfect (or almost-perfect) H-packing.

It turns out that, once we have the right tools, the bound on the minimum degree analogue to the one in Komlós' tiling theorem (Theorem 1.1) transfers to random graphs in a 'straightforward' way. The right tools turn out to be the sparse version of Szemerédi's regularity lemma observed by Kohayakava [14] and Rödl (unpublished) together with the KLR Conjecture, first stated in [15] and proven much later by by Balogh, Morris, and Samotij [6] and, independently, Saxton and Thomason [20]. Somewhat different version was obtained by Conlon, Gowers, Schacht, and Samotij [7] and in the same paper the authors gave the following theorem as an application. They only stated it for $H = K_\ell$ and remarked that the same proof works for any H.

Theorem 1.2. *For any graph H which contains a cycle and a constant $\gamma > 0$, there exist constants $b, C > 0$ such that if $p \geq Cn^{-1/m_2(H)}$, where*

$$m_2(H) = \max\left\{\frac{e(H')-1}{v(H')-2} \colon H' \subseteq H \ \text{ and } \ v(H') \geq 3\right\},$$

then with probability at least $1 - e^{-bn^2p}$ the random graph $\Gamma \sim \mathcal{G}(n,p)$ has the property that every spanning subgraph $G \subseteq \Gamma$ with minimum degree

$$\delta(G) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)} + \gamma\right) np$$

contains an H-packing which covers all but at most γn vertices.

It is known that for $p \ll n^{-1/m_2(H)}$ a.a.s there exists a spanning graph $G \subseteq \mathcal{G}(n,p)$ with $\delta(G) = (1 - o(1))np$ which does not contain a copy of H. Therefore, the bound on p in Theorem 1.2 is the best possible even if we only want to cover a linear fraction of all the vertices. Moreover, the

[1] Asymptotically almost surely, i.e. with probability going to 1 as $n \to \infty$.

constructions which show the optimality of $\delta(G)$ in Theorem 1.1 also show that by reducing the constant factor in the minimum degree to $1 - 1/\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H) - \varepsilon$ one cannot hope to cover more than $(1-\varepsilon)n$ vertices and thus the leftover can not be an arbitrarily small linear fraction.

Getting rid of the linear leftover in Theorem 1.2 seems to be a difficult task. Huang, Lee, and Sudakov [11] showed that for constant p and minimum degree at least $(1-\chi(H)+\gamma)np$ one obtains a.a.s. a perfect H-packing if H contains a vertex which does not belong to K_3, and otherwise there exists an H-packing covering all but at most $O(p^{-2})$ vertices. Moreover, they showed that the bound on the number of leftover vertices in the latter case is optimal up to the constant factor. Significantly improving the bound on p, Balogh, Lee, and Samotij [5] showed that for a constant $\gamma > 0$ and $p \geq (C \log n/n)^{1/2}$ a.a.s every spanning subgraph $G \subseteq \mathcal{G}(n,p)$ with minimum degree $\delta(G) \geq (1/2+\gamma)np$ contains a K_3-packing which covers all but at most $O(p^{-2})$ vertices. The authors further suggested that the $\sqrt{\log n}$ factor in the bound on p is not needed, which we confirm in Theorem 1.3. Recently, Allen, Böttcher, Ehrenmüller, and Taraz [1], relying on a sparse version of the *blow-up lemma*, announced that the result of Huang et al. holds for $p \geq (C \log n/n)^{1/\Delta}$, where Δ is the maximum degree of a given graph H.

1.2 Our contribution

We give a short proof of the theorem which replaces γn in Theorem 1.2 by $\gamma(C/p)^{m_2(H)}$, which is clearly better for all $p > Cn^{-1/m_2(H)}$. The proof is based on simple bootstraping of Theorem 1.2, which might be of independent interest.

Theorem 1.3. *For any graph H which contains a cycle and a constant $\gamma > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that if $Cn^{-1/m_2(H)} \leq p \leq (\log n)^{-1/(m_2(H)-1)}$ then $\Gamma \sim \mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s has the property that every spanning subgraph $G \subseteq \Gamma$ with*

$$\delta(G) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)} + \gamma\right) np$$

contains an H-packing which covers all but at most $\gamma(C/p)^{m_2(H)}$ vertices.

Let us briefly compare our result to that of Allen et al. [1]. On the one hand, for large values of p our theorem gives weaker bound on the size of the largest H-packing whenever $m_2(H) > 2$ or H contains a vertex which does not belong to K_3. This difference is the most drastic in the case where H is a bipartite graph, in which case the result of Allen et al. implies the existence of a perfect H-packing. On the other hand, our theorem is stronger in the sense that it applies for the whole range of p for which the problem is sensible. The result of Allen et al. requires $p \geq (\log n/n)^{1/\Delta}$ and it is easy to check that for all connected graphs H which contain a cycle, other than $H = K_3$, we have $m_2(H) < \Delta$. In particular, this leaves a gap in the covered range of p for all such graphs.

As a corollary we answer the question of Balogh et al. in the special case where $H = K_3$. As already mentioned, the following result is optimal with respect to all parameters, except for the technical upper bound on p.

Corollary 1.4. *Given a constant $\gamma > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that if $Cn^{-1/2} \leq p \leq (\log n)^{-1}$ then $\Gamma \sim \mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s has the property that every spanning subgraph $G \subseteq \Gamma$ with $\delta(G) \geq (2/3+\gamma)np$ contains a K_3-packing which covers all but at most $\gamma(C/p)^2$ vertices.*

The paper is organised as follows. In the next section we give the proof of Theorem 1.3. In Section 3 we discuss bounds on the number of leftover vertices in different ranges of p. In particular,

the obtained bounds suggest that Theorem 1.3 can be improved in many cases. Finally, some further research directions and open problems are discussed in Section 4.

Notation. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, we denote with $v(G)$ and $e(G)$ the size of its vertex and edge set, respectively. For a subset $S \subseteq V$ we use the standard notation $G[S]$ to denote the subgraph of G induced by S, i.e. the graph with the vertex set S consisting of the edges of G with both endpoints in S. A partition of a set is a family of pairwise *disjoint* subsets which cover the whole set. Whenever the use of floors and ceilings is not crucial it will be omitted.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.3

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is based on iterated application of the following corollary of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 2.1. *For any graph H which contains a cycle and a constant $\gamma > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that if $Cn^{-1/m_2(H)} \leq p \leq (\log n)^{-1/(m_2(H)-1)}$ then $\Gamma \sim \mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s has the property that every subgraph $G \subseteq \Gamma$ with $v(G) \geq (C/p)^{m_2(H)}$ and minimum degree $\delta(G) \geq (1 - \frac{1}{\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)} + \gamma)v(G)p$ contains an H-packing which covers all but at most $\gamma v(G)$ vertices.*

Proof. Let C and b be constants given by Theorem 1.2 applied with H and γ. We may assume that $C > 2/b$. We show that for every subset $S \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ of size $|S| = s \geq (C/p)^{m_2(H)}$, the induced subgraph $\Gamma[S]$ has the property that every spanning subgraph $G \subseteq \Gamma[S]$ with minimum degree $\delta(G) \geq (1 - 1/\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H) + \gamma)sp$ contains an H-packing which covers all but at most γs vertices. This clearly implies the lemma.

From $s \geq (C/p)^{m_2(H)}$ we have $p \geq Cs^{-1/m_2(H)}$, thus by Theorem 1.2 the induced subgraph $\Gamma[S] \sim \mathcal{G}(s,p)$ has the desired property with probability at least $1 - e^{-bs^2p}$. From the upper bound on p we further get

$$s \geq (C/p)^{m_2(H)} \geq Cp^{-1}p^{-m_2(H)+1} \geq Cp^{-1}\log n.$$

Therefore, $\Gamma[S]$ has the described property with probability at least $1 - n^{-2s}$, which is good enough to handle a union-bound over all possible sets S. □

Having Lemma 2.1 at hand we describe our proof strategy. First, we partition the vertex set of G into subsets $V_1 \dot\cup \ldots \dot\cup V_q$ of gradually decreasing size, with $V_q = \Theta(p^{-m_2(H)})$ being large enough to satisfy the requirement of Lemma 2.1. By doing this at random we make sure that every vertex has 'good' degree into every such subset. Now apply Lemma 2.1 on the largest subset V_1 to cover all but at most $\gamma|V_1|$ vertices, denoted by U_1. Even though the subgraph $G[U_1]$ might be empty, we know that every vertex in $U_1 \cup V_2$ has good degree into V_2. Crucially, if U_1 is much smaller than V_2, the second largest subset, then the number of neighbours of each $v \in U_1 \cup V_2$ relative to the size of $U_1 \cup V_2$ is negligibly smaller than relative to the size of V_2. Since the latter is sufficiently large, by carefully choosing the constants we obtain the required minimum degree of $G[U_1 \cup V_2]$ in order to apply Lemma 2.1. This way we obtain an H-packing of $G[U \cup V_2]$ which covers all but at most $\gamma(|U_1| + |V_2|) \leq 2\gamma|V_2|$ vertices, denoted by U_2, and recall that all the vertices in $V_1 \setminus U$ are already covered. Now we repeat the same on the subgraph $G[U_2 \cup V_3]$ to obtain an H-packing of $G[V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3]$ which covers all but at most $2\gamma|V_3|$ vertices, and so on until we cover all but at most $2\gamma|V_q|$ vertices in G. We now make this precise.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let C be a constant given by Lemma 2.1 applied with H and $\gamma/20$ (as γ). We show that if $\Gamma \sim \mathcal{G}(n,p)$ satisfies the property of Lemma 2.1 with these parameters then every spanning subgraph $G \subseteq \Gamma$ with the required minimum degree contains an H-packing which covers all but at most $\gamma(C/p)^{m_2(H)}$ vertices. Since the previous happens a.a.s for p as stated, this proves the theorem. For the rest of the proof we let $G \subseteq \Gamma$ be an arbitrary spanning subgraph with $\delta(G) \geq (1 - 1/\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H) + \gamma)np$.

Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$ be the largest integer such that $n/2^{q-1} > \lceil (C/p)^{m_2(H)} \rceil$ and consider a random partition of $V(G)$ into subsets $V_1, \dots, V_q$ with $|V_i| = \lfloor n/2^i \rfloor$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, q-1\}$. Observe that

$$|V_q| = n - \sum_{i<q} \lfloor n/2^i \rfloor \geq n - n \sum_{i<q} 2^{-i} = n/2^{q-1},$$

and similarly $|V_q| \leq n/2^{q-1} + q$. Therefore, from $p \leq (\log n)^{-1/(m_2(H)-1)}$ we obtain

$$|V_i| \geq n/2^{q-1} - 1 \geq (C/p)^{m_2(H)} \geq Cp^{-1} \log n \tag{1}$$

for every $i \in [q]$. The expected number of neighbours of each vertex $v \in V(G)$ in V_i is at least $(1-1/\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)+\gamma)|V_i|p$, thus it follows from the Chernoff's inequality for hypergeometric distributions that

$$\Pr\left[\deg_G(v, V_i) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)} + \gamma/2\right)|V_i|p\right] = e^{-\Omega(|V_i|p)} \overset{(1)}{<} 1/n^2.$$

(In the last inequality we assumed C is sufficiently large.) A simple application of a union-bound shows that there exists a partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup \ldots \cup V_q$ with sizes as stated above such that for each $v \in V(G)$ and each V_i we have

$$\deg_G(v, V_i) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)} + \gamma/2\right)|V_i|p. \tag{2}$$

Our plan is to inductively find an H-packing of $G[V_1 \cup \ldots \cup V_i]$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$ which covers all but at most $\gamma|V_i|/10$ vertices. Calculation similar to the one in (1) shows that

$$|V_q| \leq n/2^{q-1} + q \leq 2(C/p)^{m_2(H)} + \log n \leq 3(C/p)^{m_2(H)},$$

where in the second inequality we used the maximality of q and an implicit assumption that n is sufficiently large. Therefore, such an H-packing for $i = q$ covers all but at most $\gamma|V_q|/10 \leq \gamma(C/p)^{m_2(H)}$ vertices of G which proves the theorem.

For $i = 1$ we get the desired packing by simply applying Lemma 2.1 on $G[V_1]$. This is indeed possible since $|V_1| \geq (C/p)^{m_2(H)}$ (see (1)) and the minimum degree holds by (2). Note that we obtain slightly larger packing than needed (i.e. we cover all but at most $\gamma|V_1|/20$ vertices).

Next, let us suppose that there exists such an H-packing for some $i < q$ and let $U \subseteq V_1 \cup \ldots \cup V_i$ denote the subset of vertices which are not covered. Then $|U| \leq \gamma|V_i|/10 \leq \gamma|V_{i+1}|/4$, and for every vertex $v \in V(G)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\deg_G(v, U \cup V_{i+1}) \geq \deg_G(v, V_{i+1}) &\overset{(2)}{\geq} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)} + \gamma/2\right)|V_{i+1}|p \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)} + \gamma/2\right)\frac{|U| + |V_{i+1}|}{1 + \gamma/4}p \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)} + \gamma/4\right)|U \cup V_{i+1}|p.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, this implies

$$\delta(G[U \cup V_{i+1}]) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)} + \gamma/4\right) |U \cup V_{i+1}|p,$$

and, as $|V_{i+1}| \geq (C/p)^{m_2(H)}$ (see (1)), we can apply Lemma 2.1 to obtain an H-packing of $G[U \cup V_{i+1}]$ which covers all but at most $\gamma|U \cup V_{i+1}|/20 \leq \gamma|V_{i+1}|/10$ vertices. Since all vertices in $\bigcup_{j \leq i} V_j \setminus U$ are already covered by the packing obtained for i, this gives the desired H-packing of $G[V_1 \cup \ldots \cup V_{i+1}]$. □

3 A lower bound on the number of leftover vertices

The bound on the number of leftover vertices in Theorem 1.3 asymptotically matches the lower bound obtained by Balogh et al. [11] in the case of triangles. As we will see shortly, the situation is quite different for arbitrary graphs. In this section we obtain a general lower bound on the number of leftover vertices for an arbitrary graph H and compare it with the result from Theorem 1.3.

We make use of a concentration inequality by Kim and Vu [13], slightly rephrased for our particular application.

Theorem 3.1 (Kim-Vu Polynomial Concentration)**.** *Let $\mathcal{H} = (V(\mathcal{H}), E(\mathcal{H}))$ be a k-uniform hypergraph on n vertices and let $\{t_i \colon i \in V(\mathcal{H})\}$ be a set of mutually independent Bernoulli random variables with $E[t_i] = p$. For a subset of vertices $S \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$ let us denote*

$$Y_S = \sum_{\substack{e \in E(\mathcal{H}) \\ S \subseteq e}} \prod_{i \in e} t_i$$

and for $i \in \{0, 1 \ldots, k\}$ we set $E_i = \max_{S \subseteq V(\mathcal{H}), |S| = i} E[Y_S]$. Furthermore, let $E' = \max_{i \geq 1} E_i$ and $E_{\mathcal{H}} = \max_{i \geq 0} E_i$. Then for any $\lambda > 1$ it holds

$$\Pr[|Y_\emptyset - E_0| > a_k \sqrt{E' E_{\mathcal{H}}} \lambda^k] < d_k e^{-\lambda} n^{k-1},$$

where $a_k = 8^k (k!)^{1/2}$ and $d_k = 2e^2$.

The following lemma states the main result of the section. The lemma is formulated for a general graph H which contains a cycle and afterwards we give two corollaries for the case of cliques and cycles.

Lemma 3.2. *For any graph H which contains a cycle and a constant $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $c > 0$ such that if*

$$n^{-1/m_2(H)} \leq p \leq c^2 (\log n)^{-\frac{2e(H)}{e(H)-2}} n^{-\frac{v(H)-3}{e(H)-2}}$$

then $\Gamma \sim \mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s. contains a spanning subgraph $G \subseteq \Gamma$ with $\delta(G) \geq (1-\varepsilon)np$ such that at least $c/(n^{v(H)-3} p^{e(H)-1})$ vertices are not contained in a copy of H in G.

Proof. Let c be a sufficiently small constant and in particular such that $c \leq (2e(H)v(H))^{-2e(H)}$. Consider a subset $X \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ of size $c/(n^{v(H)-3} p^{e(H)-1})$ and let $w \in V(\Gamma)$ be an arbitrary vertex from Γ. For a subset of edges $S \subseteq E(\Gamma)$ let X_S^w denote the family of copies of H in Γ which contain vertex w, intersect the set $X \setminus w$ on at least one vertex and and contain all edges from S. In particular, we denote $X^w := X_S^w$, when S is an empty set.

We define an $e(H)$-uniform hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ on the vertex set $E(K_n)$, where a set of vertices in form a hyperedge if the corresponding edges from Γ induce a copy from X^w. Let Y_S, E_i, E' and $E_{\mathcal{H}}$ be as in Theorem 3.1 applied to $\mathcal{H}$ with $e(H)$ (as k) and $\binom{n}{2}$ (as n). Note that Y_S is nothing more than the number of copies of H in X^w which contain a fixed subset of edges $S \subseteq E(\Gamma)$. In particular, $Y_\emptyset = |X^w|$ and $E_0 = E[|X^w|]$. Simple calculation shows

$$E_0 = (1+o(1))|X^w|\binom{n}{v(H)-2}p^{e(H)} \geq |X^w| n^{v(H)-2} p^{e(H)} (v(H))^{-v(H)}.$$

Let us now estimate E_i for $i \geq 1$. Since any subgraph of H with i edges contains at least $\frac{i-1}{m_2(H)}+2$ vertices (follows from the definition of $m_2(H)$) we have $E_i \leq n^{v(H)-\frac{i-1}{m_2(H)}-2} p^{e(H)-i}$. As $p \geq n^{-1/m_2(H)}$ we have that the right hand side of the previous inequality is a non-increasing function in i and thus

$$E' := \max_{i \in \{1,\ldots,e(H)\}} E_i \leq n^{v(H)-2} p^{e(H)-1}.$$

Note that from the upper bound on p we have

$$|X^w| p = \frac{c}{n^{v(H)-3} p^{e(H)-2}} \geq \frac{\log^{2e(H)} n}{c^{2e(H)-3}} \geq c^{-3} \log^{2e(H)} n,$$

where we used the fact that H contains a cycle and therefore has at least three edges. From the upper bound on c we further get

$$\frac{E_0}{\sqrt{E_0 E'}} \geq \sqrt{|X^w| p (v(H))^{-v(H)}} \geq \sqrt{c^{-3} (\log n)^{2e(H)} (v(H))^{-v(H)}} \geq (2e(H) \log n)^{e(H)}. \tag{3}$$

From Kim-Vu Polynomial Concentration Theorem, together with the fact $E_0 \geq E_{\mathcal{H}} \geq E'$ and (3), we obtain a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\Pr[|X^w| \geq C E[|X^w|] \leq e^{-2\log n}.$$

Taking a union-bound over all vertices, this implies that a.a.s for every vertex $w \in V(\Gamma)$ the number of copies of H which contain w and intersect $X^w \setminus w$ is at most $C|X^w| n^{v(H)-2} p^{e(H)}$. Recall that $|X^w| = c/(n^{v(H)-3} p^{e(H)-1})$, thus by setting $c := \min\{\varepsilon/C, (2e(H)v(H))^{-2e(H)}\}$ we have that $|X^w|$ is at most εnp for each vertex $w \in V(\Gamma)$.

Finally, we obtain the graph $G \subseteq \Gamma$ (initially set $G := \Gamma$) by iterating the following procedure until there remains no copy of H in G which intersects X: Let H' be a copy of H which intersects X and let $\{v, w\} \in E(H')$ be an edge such that $H' \in X^v \cap X^w$. Delete edge $\{v, w\}$ from G. Such edge must exist for the following reason. If H' intersects X on more than one vertex then it is easy to see that any edge would do. In the case when H' intersects X on exactly one vertex, then since H contains a cycle there must exist an edge which is disjoint from X and this edge satisfies the desired property.

The procedure clearly stops and we just need to show that the remaining graph has the desired minimal degree. Let v be a vertex and e an arbitrary deleted edge incident to v. Since e was originally contained in an H-copy from X^v, from the fact that $|X^v| \leq \varepsilon np$ we conclude that at most εnp such edges incident to v are deleted. This finishes the proof. □

We state some corollaries of Lemma 3.2. In the following corollary, which follows directly from Lemma 3.2, we use C_t to denote a cycle on t vertices.

Corollary 3.3 (Cycles)**.** *Given an integer $t \geq 3$ and a constant $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive constant $c > 0$ such that if*

$$n^{-1/m_2(C_t)} \leq p \leq c^2 \log^{-2t/(t-2)} n^{-\frac{t-3}{t-2}}$$

then $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s. contains a spanning subgraph of minimum degree at least $(1-\varepsilon)np$ such that at least

$$c/(n^{t-3}p^{t-1})$$

vertices are not contained in C_t.

When $t = 4$ the upper bound on p in the previous corollary is $n^{-1/2}\log^{-4} n$. On the other hand, Allen et. al [1] showed that if $p \gg (\log n/n)^{1/2}$ then every subgraph of $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ with minimum degree at least $(1/2 + o(1))np$ contains a C_4-packing which covers all the vertices (assuming the divisibility constraint). In the remaining regime of p, Theorem 1.3 gives a C_4-packing which covers all but at most $O(p^{-m_2(C_4)}) = O(p^{-3/2})$ vertices, whereas Corollary 3.3 shows that no C_4-packing can have a leftover smaller than $\Omega(1/(np^3))$. In particular, this leaves a gap when $n^{-2/3} \leq p \leq n^{-1/2}$. For cycles of bigger length the result from [1] still applies only for $p \gg (\log n/n)^{-1/2}$ while the bound on p in Corollary 3.3 becomes smaller.

Next claim is corollary of Lemma 3.2 applied to the case of complete graphs.

Corollary 3.4 (Complete graphs)**.** *Given an integer $t \geq 3$ and a constant $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $c > 0$ such that if*

$$n^{-1/m_2(K_t)} \leq p \ll 1$$

then $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s. contains a spanning subgraph of minumum degree at least $(1-\varepsilon)np$ such that at least

$$\max_{\ell \in \{3,\dots,t\}} \{c/(n^{\ell-3}p^{\ell(\ell-1)/2-1})\}$$

vertices are not contained in a copy of K_t.

Proof. Let us for simplicity denote $m(t) := \max_{\ell\in\{3,\dots,t\}}\{1/(n^{\ell-3}p^{\ell(\ell-1)/2-1})\}$. We prove the claim by induction on t. For the base of induction, i.e. $t = 3$, the claim follows directly from the result of Balogh et. al. [5] (c.f. Proposition 4.6) in the case when $p \geq Cn^{-1/m_2(K_3)}$, for some large enough constant C, and by Lemma 3.2 when $n^{-m_2(K_3)} \leq p \leq Cn^{-1/m_2(K_3)}$. Let us now assume that the corollary holds for all $t' < t$ and $t \geq 4$. Note that

$$\frac{1}{n^{t-3}p^{t(t-1)/2-1}} \leq \frac{1}{p^2}$$

when $p^{t(t-1)/2-3}n^{t-3} \geq 1$. However, this conditions is true when $p \geq n^{-1/m_2(K_{t+1})}$ since

$$\frac{t(t-1)/2-3}{t-3} = \frac{t^2-t-6}{2(t-3)} = \frac{(t+2)(t-3)}{2(t-3)} = \frac{(t+2)(t-1)}{2(t-1)} = \frac{(t+1)t-2}{2(t-1)} = m_2(K_{t+1}).$$

This implies $m(t-1) = m(t)$, when $p \geq n^{-1/m_2(K_{t+1})}$. Therefore, by induction hypothesis there exist a constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s contains a spanning subgraph with minimum degree at least $(1-\varepsilon)np$ such that at least $c \cdot m(t)$ vertices are not contained in a copy of K_{t-1} and, consequently, in a copy of K_t. On other hand, if $n^{-1/m_2(K_t)} \leq p \leq n^{-1/m_2(K_{t+1})}$ then we can use Lemma 3.2 applied to $H = K_t$ to obtain the result, since $\frac{e(K_t)-2}{v(K_t)-3} > m_2(K_{t+1})$. □

Recall that the bound of Balogh et al. [5] implies that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t \geq 4$ there exists a constant C such that if $p \geq Cn^{-m_2(K_t)}$ then $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s contains a spanning subgraph with minimum degree $(1-\varepsilon)np$ such that $\Omega(p^{-2})$ vertices do not belong to a copy of K_t. The corollary above guarantees a larger set of 'isolated' vertices in the certain range of p. For example, in the case of K_4 and p in the interval $n^{-m_2(K_4)} \leq p \ll n^{-1/3}$ we obtain a spanning subgraph which contains $c/(np^5) \gg 1/p^2$ vertices that are not contained in a copy of K_4. On the other hand, Theorem 1.3 gives the existence of an H-packing which covers all but at most $O(p^{-m_2(K_4)}) = O(p^{-5/2})$ vertices. A simple calculations shows that this leaves the gap in such range of p. In the case of larger complete graphs the situation becomes even less clear.

4 Concluding remarks

Using a simple bootstrapping approach, we showed that if $p \geq Cn^{-1/m_2(H)}$ then $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s has the property that every spanning subgraph with the minimum degree at least $(1-1/\chi_{\mathrm{cr}}(H)+\gamma)np$ contains an H-packing which covers all but at most $O(p^{-m_2(H)})$ vertices. As observed in [5] this is the best one can hope for in the case where $H = K_3$, since $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ contains a spanning subgraph with minimum degree $(1-o(1))np$ and a set of $\Omega(p^{-m_2(K_3)})$ vertices which do not belong to a copy of K_3. This leads to the following question.

Question 1. *Let $t \geq 3$ be an integer, and suppose $p \gg n^{-1/m_2(K_t)}$ and $t \mid n$. Is it true that $\Gamma \sim \mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s has the property that every spanning subgraph $G \subseteq \Gamma$ such that*

- *the minimum degree of G is at least $(1-1/t+o(1))np$, and*
- *every vertex is contained in $\varepsilon n^{t-1} p^{\binom{t}{2}}$ copies of K_t*

contains a K_t-factor?

Our result from Corollary 3.3 shows that for the case of C_4 some leftover is unavoidable when $n^{-1/2-o(1)}$, while the result of Allen et al. shows that the minimum degree is indeed sufficient for the existence of a C_4-factor when $p \gg n^{-1/2}$. However, for $t \geq 5$ their result has the same lower bound on p, while Corollary 3.3 shows that the leftover is unavoidable only when $p \leq n^{-(t-3)/(t-2)-o(1)}$. It is therefore tempting to conjecture that already $p \geq n^{-(t-3)/(t-2)}$ is enough for the existence of a C_5-factor. The proof in [1] relies on a general blow-up lemma [2] in which the bound on p heavily depends on the maximum degree of the graph we wish to embed. Proving a better bound on p for such a lemma seems difficult, however, it is plausible that a version tailored for packings of small cycles might be easier to obtain. Having said this we ask the following question.

Question 2. *Let $t \geq 5$ be an integer, and suppose $p \gg n^{-(t-3)/(t-2)}$ and $t \mid n$. Is it true that $\Gamma \sim \mathcal{G}(n,p)$ a.a.s has the property that every spanning subgraph $G \subseteq \Gamma$, such that the minimum degree of G is at least $(1-1/\chi(C_t)+o(1))np$, contains a C_t-factor?*

References

[1] P. Allen, J. Böttcher, J. Ehrenmüller, and A. Taraz. Local resilience of spanning subgraphs in sparse random graphs. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 49:513–521, 2015.

[2] P. Allen, J. Böttcher, H. Hàn, Y. Kohayakawa, and Y. Person. Blow-up lemmas for sparse graphs. 2016. In preparation.

[3] N. Alon and R. Yuster. Almost H-factors in dense graphs. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 8(2):95–102, 1992.

[4] N. Alon and R. Yuster. H-factors in dense graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 66(2):269–282, 1996.

[5] J. Balogh, C. Lee, and W. Samotij. Corrádi and Hajnal's theorem for sparse random graphs. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 21(1-2):23–55, 2012.

[6] J. Balogh, R. Morris, and W. Samotij. Independent sets in hypergraphs. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 28(3):669–709, 2015.

[7] D. Conlon, W. Gowers, W. Samotij, and M. Schacht. On the KŁR conjecture in random graphs. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 203(1):535–580, 2014.

[8] K. Corrádi and A. Hajnal. On the maximal number of independent circuits in a graph. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 14:423–439, 1963.

[9] P. Erdős and A. Rényi. On the evolution of random graphs. *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.*, 5:17–61, 1960.

[10] A. Hajnal and E. Szemerédi. Proof of a conjecture of P. Erdős. In *Combinatorial theory and its applications, II (Proc. Colloq., Balatonfüred, 1969)*, pages 601–623. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1970.

[11] H. Huang, C. Lee, and B. Sudakov. Bandwidth theorem for random graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 102(1):14–37, 2012.

[12] A. Johansson, J. Kahn, and V. Vu. Factors in random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 33(1):1–28, 2008.

[13] J. H. Kim and V. H. Vu. Concentration of multivariate polynomials and its applications. *Combinatorica*, 20(3):417–434, 2000.

[14] Y. Kohayakawa. Szemerédi's regularity lemma for sparse graphs. In *Foundations of computational mathematics*, pages 216–230. Springer, 1997.

[15] Y. Kohayakawa, T. Łuczak, and V. Rödl. On K_4-free subgraphs of random graphs. *Combinatorica*, 17(2):173–213, 1997.

[16] J. Komlós. Tiling Turán theorems. *Combinatorica*, 20(2):203–218, 2000.

[17] J. Komlós, G. Sárközy, and E. Szemerédi. Proof of the Alon–Yuster conjecture. *Discrete Mathematics*, 235(1):255–269, 2001.

[18] D. Kühn and D. Osthus. Embedding large subgraphs into dense graphs. In *Surveys in combinatorics 2009*, volume 365 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 137–167. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2009.

[19] D. Kühn and D. Osthus. The minimum degree threshold for perfect graph packings. *Combinatorica*, 29(1):65–107, 2009.

[20] D. Saxton and A. Thomason. Hypergraph containers. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 201(3):925–992, 2015.

[21] A. Shokoufandeh and Y. Zhao. Proof of a tiling conjecture of Komlós. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 23(2):180–205, 2003.